

## Subpart 1515.2—Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals and Information

### 1515.209 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

In addition to those provisions prescribed at FAR 15.209 and in accordance with FAR 15.203(a)(4), the contracting officer shall identify and include the evaluation factors that will be considered in making the source selection and their relative importance in each solicitation.

(a) The contracting officer shall insert the provisions at 1552.215–70, “EPA Source Evaluation and Selection Procedures—Negotiated Procurement” and either: the provision at 1552.215–71, “Evaluation Factors for Award,” where all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined are significantly more important than cost or price; or the provision in Alternate I to 1552.215–71, where all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined are significantly less important than cost or price; or the provision in Alternate II to 1552.215–71, where all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined are approximately equal to cost or price; or Alternate III to 1552.215–71 where award will be made to the offeror with the lowest-evaluated cost or price whose proposal meets or exceeds the acceptability standards for non-cost factors.

(b) Evaluation factors and significant subfactors should be prepared in accordance with FAR 15.305 and inserted into paragraph (b) of the provision at 1552.215–71, Alternate I, Alternate II, and if used, in Alternate III.

(c) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1552.215–75, Past Performance Information, or a clause substantially the same as 1552.215–75, in all competitively negotiated acquisitions with an estimated value in excess of \$100,000.

[64 FR 47410, Aug. 31, 1999, as amended at 65 FR 58923, Oct. 3, 2000]

## Subpart 1515.3—Source Selection

### 1515.302 Applicability.

FAR subpart 15.3 and this subpart apply to the selection of source or sources in competitive negotiation acquisitions in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold, except architect-engineering services which are covered in 1536.6.

### 1515.303 Responsibilities.

The Source Selection Authority (SSA) is established as follows:

(a) Acquisitions having a potential value of \$25,000,000 or more: Service Center Manager (SCM). This authority is not redelegable.

(b) Acquisitions having a potential value of less than \$25,000,000, but more than \$10,000,000: SCM, who has the authority to redelegate SSA authority to a warranted 1102. If redelegated, review by another warranted 1102 designated by the SCM is also required. A Regional Contracting Officer Supervisor may act as the SSA, as determined on a case-by-case basis, by the Director, Superfund/RCRA Regional Procurement Operations Division (SRRPOD).

(c) Acquisitions having a potential value of \$10,000,000 or less: The contracting officer.

[67 FR 5072, Feb. 4, 2002]

### 1515.305 Proposal evaluation.

#### 1515.305–70 Scoring plans.

When trade-offs are performed (in accordance with FAR 15.101–1), the evaluation of technical and past performance shall be accomplished using the following scoring plan or one specifically developed for the solicitation, e.g., other numeric, adjectival, color rating systems, etc.

#### SCORING PLAN

Value	Descriptive statement
0 .....	The factor is not addressed, or is totally deficient and without merit.

## SCORING PLAN—Continued

Value	Descriptive statement
1 .....	The factor is addressed, but contains deficiencies and/or weaknesses that can be corrected only by major or significant changes to relevant portions of the proposal, or the factor is addressed so minimally or vaguely that there are widespread information gaps. In addition, because of the deficiencies, weaknesses, and/or information gaps, serious concerns exist on the part of the technical evaluation team about the offeror's ability to perform the required work.
2 .....	Information related to the factor is incomplete, unclear, or indicates an inadequate approach to, or understanding of the factor. The technical evaluation team believes there is question as to whether the offeror would be able to perform satisfactorily.
3 .....	The response to the factor is adequate. Overall, it meets the specifications and requirements, such that the technical evaluation team believes that the offeror could perform to meet the Government's minimum requirements.
4 .....	The response to the factor is good with some superior features. Information provided is generally clear, and the demonstrated ability to accomplish the technical requirements is acceptable with the possibility of more than adequate performance.
5 .....	The response to the factor is superior in most features.

**1515.305-71 Documentation of proposal evaluation.**

In addition to the information required by FAR 15.305(a)(3), the technical evaluation documentation shall include:

(a) Score sheets prepared by each individual team member must be made available upon the contracting officer's request. For contracts valued at \$10,000,000 or less, the technical evaluation may be recorded on the short form technical evaluation format (EPA Form 1900-61) or another form specifically developed for the solicitation; and

(b) A statement that the respective team members are free from actual or potential personal conflicts of interest, and are in compliance with the Office of Government Ethics ethics provisions at 5 CFR part 2635.

(c) Any information which might reveal that an offeror has an actual or potential organizational conflict of interest.

(d) Any documentation related to exchanges with individual offerors.

**1515.305-72 Release of cost information.**

(a) In accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(4), the contracting officer may release the cost/price proposals to those members of the evaluation team who are evaluating proposals at his/her discretion.

(b) These individuals would then use this information to perform a cost realism analysis as described in FAR 15.404-1(d). Any inconsistencies be-

tween the proposals and the solicitation requirements and/or any inconsistencies between the cost/price and other than cost/price proposals should be identified.

**Subpart 1515.4—Contract Pricing****1515.404-4 Profit.**

This section implements FAR 15.404-4 and prescribes the EPA structured approach for establishing profit or fee prenegotiation objectives.

**1515.404-470 Policy.**

(a) The Agency's policy is to utilize profit to attract contractors who possess talents and skills necessary to the accomplishment of the objectives of the Agency, and to stimulate efficient contract performance. In negotiating profit/fee, it is necessary that all relevant factors be considered, and that fair and reasonable amounts be negotiated which give the contractor a profit objective commensurate with the nature of the work to be performed, the contractor's input to the total performance, and the risks assumed by the contractor.

(b) The purpose of EPA's structured approach is:

(1) To provide a standard method of evaluation;

(2) To ensure consideration of all relevant factors;

(3) To provide a basis for documentation and explanation of the profit or fee negotiation objective; and